

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/845,154

Applicant(s)

BOEKSTEGERS, PETER

Examiner

Urmi Chattopadhyay

Art Unit

3738

All Participants:

(1) Urmi Chattopadhyay.

(2) Michael Kim.

Status of Application: Non-Final before Interview

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2004

Time: 10:25am

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *None.*

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, second paragraph and 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1, 26, 46, 54, 56, 57, 92, 94 and 101

Prior art documents discussed:

Rapacki et al. (USPAP 2002/0161424 as cited in applicant's IDS)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: All previously withdrawn claims are no longer withdrawn from consideration. Discussed providing antecedent basis for "coronary vessel" and "heart chamber" in each of independent claims 1, 46 and 101 by changing "the" to --a--, and changing the dependency of claim 26 from claim 1 to claim 86 to provide antecedent basis for "the passageway". Discussed changing the dependencies of claims 54, 56 and 57 from claim 53, which had been cancelled, to claim 46, and canceling claim 92 for being the same as claim 94. Also discussed a 103(a) rejection of claims 46 and 101 by Rapacki et al., wherein the method shown in Figure 19 is modified to deliver the stent of Figure 13 to meet all the claimed steps, but the steps occurring in a different order or simultaneously. Amending claims 46 and 101 so that the placement of the guidewire through the needle has to occur after the needle is inserted through anterior and posterior walls of the coronary vessel was discussed as overcoming the rejection. On 4/16/04, discussed with Susanne Jones changing "inserting" to --placing-- in claim 54 to be more consistent with the language of claim 46, on which it depends.